tion or in any statement of fact which may be required under section 308.

The requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission imposed a burden on the public, and also on the Commission in those instances where the applicant omits the required oath or affirmation. In such cases the workload of the Commission is increased to the extent necessary to return reports or application forms for the required verification. This slows up the consideration by the Commission of the matters involved and the processing of applications. Inconvenience and delay to the public result.

The Commission feels, therefore, that the elimination of the oath or affirmation requirements would not adversely affect its interest in view of the aforementioned provisions of the United States Code and the Communications Act, and accordingly urges the enactment of the proposed legislation.

S. 1737. A bill to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1737 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE V OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO IMPOSE FORFEITURES IN CASES OF VIOLATION OF CERTAIN RULES AND REGULATIONS BY RADIO STATIONS IN THE NONBROADCAST SERVICES

The attached legislative proposal amends title V of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by adding at the end thereof a new section 508. Its purpose is to grant to the Federal Communications Commission authority to impose monetary forfeitures for violations of certain of its rules and regulations relating to radio stations in the common carrier and safety and special fields. This proposal also provides for remission or mitigation by the Commission of such forfeitures by an appropriate amendment to section 504(b) of the Communications Act. (47 U.S.C. 504(b).)

The need for this legislation is emphasized by the rapid and phenomenal expansion in the nonbroadcast radio service since World War II due in large measure to the development of new equipment and the utilization of new portions of the frequency spectrum. Many small companies have been licensed to operate radio stations as specialized common carriers; a still greater expansion has taken place in what are known as the safety and special radio services where radio is employed for numerous diverse purposes by large groups of users such as the maritime and aviation interests, police and fire departments, electric and gas companies, forestry agencies, taxicab companies, highway, truck, and bus companies, etc.

As of September 30, 1958, the number of radio stations (computed on the basis of call letters assigned) in the safety and special radio services alone had risen to 457,124. This represents an increase of several hundred percent over the stations which had been authorized in these services as of June 30, 1946.

In the number of small boats equipped for radiotelephone communications, there has been an increase of approximately 400 percent (from 18,140 to 70,911) for the period 1949 to 1959. One of the most serious enforcement problems confronting the Commission results from the chaotic conditions existing on the small boat radiotelephone frequencies between 2 and 3 megacycles. In areas where there are concentrations of these boats, the misuse of the distress frequency has prevented the transmission of emergency messages to the Coast Guard. Normal enforcement methods such as issuances of rule violation notices and suspension of operator licenses have only been partially successful. During the first quarter of the fiscal year 1959, a total of 558 small boat radio stations were inspected. There were 371 violation notices issued as the result of noncompliance with the Commission's regulations. In addition, 159, or 28 percent, were found to be operating without authority from the Commission. Since inspection of 558 vessels is a very limited sampling of 70,000 boats licensed by the Commission, it is evident that disregard for the Commission's regulations is widespread. These statistics emphasize the inadequacy of the Commission's available enforcement tools in coping with this situation.

One result of the extensive increase in licensed stations in recent years has been a marked increase in the number of violations of the Commission's technical rules and regulations. This is particularly true in some of the newer private services where radio is not the principal activity of the licensee but is utilized as an adjunct to his primary business activities, and the station operators are accordingly less concerned with the necessity for adhering to the technical rules governing the use of radio. Most of the offenses are, taken individually, of a comparatively minor nature. Collectively, however, because of their number and variety they represent a very real menace to the orderly use of the radio spectrum and to efficient regulation by the Commission. In addition, these violations result in a serious menace to life and property in those services, such as maritime and aviation, where radio serves as a vital and necessary safety device.

The Commission has found that its existing sanctions are inadequate to handle the situation which confronts it. These existing sanctions, such as criminal penalties, revocation of licenses, and issuance of cease and desist orders, are normally too drastic for the relatively minor types of offenses involved, and too cumbersome and time-consuming considering the multitude of violations that occur. In aggravated cases these more drastic sanctions are, of course, available for use. However, the Commission is reluctant in any event to take action which will result in depriving a licensee of radio when it is being used for safety purposes, such as on an aircraft or a ship.

Congress has recognized the need for this type of forfeiture authority and has given it to various Government agencies. Thus, Congress has made a broad provision for civil penalties for violations of the Civil Aeronautics Act and certain regulations issued under that act (49 U.S.C. 62). And see, also, title 8, United States Code, section 1321 et seq. (aliens and nationality); title 46, United States Code, section 526 (o) and (p) (motorboats); title 49, United States Code, section 181(b) (aircraft); title 49, United States Code, section 322(h) (motor carriers); and title 49, United States Code, section 621 (inland waterways and air carriers). Moreover, Congress has already given such authority to the Federal Communications Commission, with respect to common carriers under title II of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and also as to those ships which are required to carry radio equipment pursuant to the provisions of part II and part III of title III of that act. (47 U.S.C., 351–364 and 381–386.)

The proposal provides that forfeiture liability shall attach only for a willful, negligent, or repeated violation of the provisions enumerated in the new section 508 to be added to the Communications Act. It further fixes a maximum forfeiture liability of $100 for the violation of the provisions of any one paragraph of the proposed section 508 and an overall maximum liability of $500 for all violations of such section occurring within 90 days prior to the date a notice of apparent liability is sent. The Commission is required to give a notice of apparent liability to such person or send it to him by registered mail and to set forth therein facts which indicate apparent liability. The person so notified of apparent liability is given the right to show cause in writing why he should not be held liable and to request a personal interview with an official of the Commission at the field office of the Commission nearest to that person's place of residence.

Procedural safeguards are available to a person charged with forfeiture liability. Not only has he the right, under section 5(d) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 155(d)) to request a review of Commission action taken, but by the extension to the new proposal of the remission and mitigation provisions of section 504(b) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 504(b)) he is afforded a further opportunity to show cause why he should not be held liable. Should such person refuse to pay the amount of a forfeiture as finally determined, he could, by such refusal, cause the United States, if it so elects, to institute a civil suit against him, as provided in sec. 504(a) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 504(a)) thereby further contesting the validity of the asserted forfeiture liability. Thus, adequate safeguards would be available for the protection of the legal rights of a person against whom a forfeiture liability is asserted.

S. 1738. A bill to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to redefine the duties and functions of the review staff.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1738 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SUBSECTION (c) OF SECTION 5 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 155(c)

The purpose of the proposed amendment to section 5(c) of the Communications Act is to afford the Commission greater discretion in the utilization of the review staff provided for by that section. This would be accomplished without allowing recommendations to be made concerning the final disposition of any adjudicatory proceeding, for final decisions in adjudicatory matters would continue to be prepared in accordance with the specific directions of the Commission. The suggested changes to 5(c) would be accomplished by deleting the fourth sentence of the present section and substituting the proposed new language.

The principal advantage of the amendment would be to expedite the disposition of adjudicatory cases by permitting the professional staff of opinions and review to assist the Commission more fully than at present on those matters which do not involve final disposition thus allowing the Commissioners to concentrate their attention on the important questions of policy, law, and fact coming before them. This would be accomplished by permitting the review staff to advise the Commission on the disposition of interlocutory matters and to prepare legal and factual analysis for the Commission's assistance in all adjudicatory matters. In connection with the changes affecting interlocutory questions, it is believed that the amendment would be administratively beneficial by contributing to the more expeditious handling of these matters.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ROBERT T. BARTLEY

In my opinion, the Commission's proposal to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 would still limit the assistance of the review staff to a far greater degree than is either necessary or desirable. It should be borne in mind that this staff has the sole function of assisting the Commission in adjudicatory cases and that it is directly responsible to the Commisisoners—it

does not investigate, it does not prosecute. To deprive the Commission of the full assistance of which this staff is capable is both wasteful and inefficient. To permit this staff to assist the Commission fully in its decisional process would not in any way deprive any party to a case of any inherent right and could contribute to speedier action.

Therefore, I do not agree with the second sentence of the Commission's proposed bill.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER FREDERICK W. FORD

I believe that section 5(c) is unduly restrictive, unnecessary, and should be repealed. Section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act relating to the separation of functions of the staff, contains all of the safeguards required.

S. 1739. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to authorize the licensing of certain rebroadcasting stations constructed without a permit under such act.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1739 is as follows:)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1959.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, in numerous small communities and outlying areas beyond the direct range of television broadcast stations, television programs are made available to local residents by means of small low-powered repeaters. These devices, located at favorable reception points on hills or mountains, pick up television signals from distant stations, amplify them and retransmit them to nearby home receivers which are unable to obtain satisfactory direct reception.

Hitherto, the Commission, cognizant of certain potentials VHF repeaters have for interference to each other and for interference to other broadcast and nonbroadcast services, has confined the authorization of repeater devices to so-called translators operating in the UHF band. UHF translators offer several distinct advantages, both as to the limitation of interference and as to the range of useful service of good grade.

Prior to and during the pendency of lengthy proceedings devoted to a study of conditions under which it might be desirable to authorize repeaters in the VHF band, numerous VHF repeaters have been installed, without FCC authorization. The Commission has direct knowledge of over 300, and it has been estimated that the total number is substantially greater. In December 1958, the Commission announced the conclusion, to which it had come at that time, that the advantages of UHF translators so outweighed the considerations favoring the authorization of VHF repeaters, that it would be in the public interest to confine repeaters to the UHF band.

Since that time, however, the Commission has had the matter under continuing review, and has received additional field data which indicate that, under certain conditions, VHF repeater operations may be conducted with less actual interference to other signals than had previously been calculated. Aware of the useful purpose served by these devices, and taking into account the investments made in those which have been installed, the Commission is now of the opinion that, if the Communications Act is appropriately amended, VHF repeaters could be licensed under conditions which will insure due protection to other users of the radio spectrum including aerial navigation services.

Under a longstanding construction by the Federal Communications Commission of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which has been upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the Commission is prohibited (with minor exceptions not relevant here) from authorizing the use of facilities for the broadcasting of signals by radio if such facilities were constructed prior to the grant of a construction permit therefor (WJIV, Inc., 231 F. 2d, 725; 97 U.S. Appeals D.C. 391).

Accordingly the Commission is separately recommending that section 319(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 be amended to permit the Commission to grant licenses to stations already constructed if they are engaged solely in rebroadcasting signals, if such stations were constructed on or before January 1, 1959, and if the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

In addition the Commission is separately recommending the amendment of section 318 of the act to clarify the statutory requirements concerning the operation of equipment (operator requirements) used for the broadcasting of signals by radio, including television repeater equipment. The text of the proposed amendments and accompanying explanations are enclosed with this letter.

Our study of the interference problem posed by the use of repeaters in the VHF band indicates the potential of interference to the following services: to other VHF repeaters, to the reception of TV programs by regular television broadcast stations operating in the VHF band, to FM radio broadcast stations, and to nonbroadcast services, such as public safety (police and forestry) services using frequencies between television channels 4 and 5 and to the operation of the aerial navigation services employing radio fan markers on 75 megacycles, also between channels 4 and 5. Taking all of these considerations into account the Commission believes that the following minimum requirements should be imposed upon the operation of VHF repeaters:

(a) Transmission of the rebroadcast signals on a channel other than the channel on which the signal is received.

(b) Maximum power output limited to no more than 1 watt.

(c) Facilities for on and off remote control.

(d) The selection of transmitting frequency, appropriate minimum mileage separation from cochannel transmitters of regular television broadcast stations (still to be determined), and such other operating conditions as may be needed to insure reasonable protection to regular broadcast and nonbroadcast services.

VHF repeaters would, in addition, come within the provisions of section 325(a) of the Communications Act requiring the permission of the originating station for the rebroadcast of programs.

In order to afford ample opportunity for the modification of existing VHF repeaters which do not at present meet the foregoing requirements the Commission contemplates allowing a reasonable period—up to 1 year—to bring existing VHF repeaters into conformity with these requirements.

Exceptionally, however, the Commission feels that in order to minimize any possible hazard to aerial navigation it is desirable to take early steps toward the elimination of the operations on channels 4 and 5 of VHF repeaters or boosters which retransmit on the same channel as the incoming signal. The object would be to eliminate the possibility of such a VHF repeater receiving, amplifying, and transmitting signals of aerial fan markers operating on 75 megacycles, with the possible result that an aircraft pilot might be misled as to his true position. While the possibilities of this occurring appear relatively remote, and while it would require a combination of circumstances in addition to the retransmission of the fan marker signal to create a serious hazard, the Commission believes that the earliest possible elimination from channels 4 and 5 of VHF repeaters which transmit on the incoming frequency is highly desirable. Although our information is not complete, such data as are available indicate that probably fewer than 5 percent of all existing VHF repeaters would fall into this category.

If any additional comments or information are desired, would you kindly let us know?

By direction of the Commission.

JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 319(D) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 (47 U.S.C. 319(D))

The development of television service throughout the United States has been hampered by the fact that in general the signals travel in a line of sight pattern. As a result, in mountainous terrain there are some valleys where a signal is not obtainable by ordinary home equipment and some of the communities are too small to support their own station.

The Commission has been endeavoring to work out a satisfactory plan for authorizing service to these isolated areas. In the meantime some communities have devised their own systems. Under the Communications Act of 1934, however, the Commission is prohibited from issuing licenses for facilities if those facilities have been constructed before the Commission granted a construction permit. (47 U.S.C. 319(d)).

In addition to the engineering problems involved as to just what system would probably be best and therefore appropriately authorized, there were considerable doubts as to the legal authority of the Commission over small local facilities relaying signals from larger stations. Concurrently with the litigation testing the Commission's legal authority, the Commission was making an effort to work out a satisfactory plan for service to these smaller communities. Under these circumstances the Commission feels that a fair amount of liberality is indicated in permitting the authorization now of facilities constructed when the ultimate jurisdiction of the Commission and the terms under which it might grant licenses were in a state of flux.

Accordingly the Commission recommends that section 319(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 be amended to permit the Commission to grant licenses to stations already constructed if they are engaged solely in rebroadcasting signals, if such stations were constructed on or before January 1, 1959, and if the Commission finds that the public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby.

S. 1740. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 in order to expand the Federal Communication Commission's regulatory authority under such section.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1740 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202(B) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED (47 U.S.C. 202(B))

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to give the Federal Communications Commission legislative authority to regulate charges and services of common carriers for the use of microwave and other point-to-point radio circuits along with the use of wires in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind. The Commission's present authority in this respect is now confined by section 202(b) of the act to the use of wires for such purposes.

Since the enactment of the Communications Act in 1934, there have been technical developments in the use of microwave and other high frequencies that have led to the increasing use of point-to-point radio as a substitute for and a supplement to the use of

wires in chain broadcasting. At the present time such point-to-point radio is widely used by common carriers in providing circuits for network broadcasting, studio-to-transmitter links, and remote pickup and control circuits for various types of radio stations. Had such facilities been perfected and in wide use in 1934 when the Communications Act was adopted, it is reasonable to believe that Congress would have included authority for their regulation also in subsection (b) of section 202 of that act. Said subsection (b) was a new provision in radio law that was incorporated in the Communications Act of 1934, "to make doubly sure that charges for wires in connection with chain broadcasting are within the jurisdiction of the Commission." (See the remarks of Representative RAYBURN in the House of Representatives on June 2, 1934, in opening the debate in the House on S. 3285, the Communications Act of 1934, 78 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10313.)

The Commission interpreted this section in 1936 in Capital City Telephone Co. (3 FCC 189) in connection with a claim of that company for exemption from certain regulatory requirements as a connecting carrier under section 2(b)(2) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 152(b)(2)). The company was at the time furnishing to a radio station certain wire lines for broadcasting purposes, which lines were located wholly within the State of Missouri. The Commission held that Congress, in enacting section 202(b), had clothed the Commission with jurisdiction over charges and services for wire lines used in chain broadcasting and other radio communication, even though the wires themselves were wholly within a State, since the complete transmission, wire and radio, was an interstate communication.

Although under section 202(b) it would appear that the Commission's jurisdiction in this field is limited to regulation of charges and services for the use of wires alone, certain carriers have continued to file tariffs with the Commission governing this service, whether by wire or radio. The proposed amendment will remove any question as to the Commission's regulatory authority over such charges insofar as radio facilities are concerned.

The proposed amendment is, therefore, recommended because of the increasing use of such radio facilities interchangeably with wire service in providing network service and control circuits furnished by common carriers to broadcasters and other radio users. It is further recommended as necessary and desirable because such amendment will give a clear statutory direction to the Federal Comunications Commission of its responsibility in this field.

S. 1741. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the requirements for operating transmitting apparatus.

(The explanation accompanying Senate bill 1741 is as follows:)

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 318 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, now provides in section 318 that the actual operation of transmitting equipment licensed under the act should be carried on only by persons holding an operator's license issued under the act. The Commission is given discretion to waive that requirement except for certain named categories. In recent years the art of transmitting has advanced tremendously and the Commission believes that it should have greater statutory latitude as to the requirements for operators of transmitting equipment engaged in broadcasting. For instance, at present there may be an inference in section 318 that the operator be in personal attendance, whereas in some situations the Commission believes that it is enough for the operator to turn the equipment on, have it operated under his general control but not be in personal attendance. This situation is particularly true of transmitters engaged solely in rebroadcasting, such as the so-called boosters in smaller communities in mountainous terrain, especially out west.

Accordingly, the Commission recommends that section 318 of the Communications Act be amended to remove the explicit requirement that transmitting equipment of broadcast stations be operated by licensed operators.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT, RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES IN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets.

I am introducing this bill at the request of the National Federation of Independent Business. George J. Burger, vice president of the federation, advises me that a poll of the national membership of the federation, which comprises more than 125,000 independent establishments, showed that 86 percent favored this proposal, 11 percent opposed, 3 percent did not vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1742) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit certain practices in commerce by any manufacturer or producer who distributes his product in commerce through his own retail outlets, direct to consumers and also through other retail outlets, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PATRIOTIC EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week. This joint resolution is a companion to House Joint Resolution 343, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on April 16 by the able Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 91) designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MANSFIELD, MOSS, HARTKE, MAGNUSON, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, JAVITS, KENNEDY, RANDOLPH, MURRAY, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, SPARKMAN, HUMPHREY, YARBOROUGH, WILEY, KEFAUVER, MORSE, HENNINGS, CARROLL, YOUNG of Ohio, JORDAN, CANNON, MCNAMARA, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and CHAVEZ, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution, the purpose of which is to encourage the development of colleges and other technical institutions of higher learning outside the continental United States. Representative BYRON JOHNSON, of Colorado, is today submitting a similar concurrent resolution in the House of Representatives.

It has been our feeling that in our programs in the field of international education, while through the Fulbright program, the exchange of students, and other programs, we have greatly aided the understanding of people, we can do much more.

A good many of our students are reluctant to come back home after participating in such programs. They find studying abroad very much to their liking. On the other hand, the number of students who can be brought to the United States for technical training is obviously limited. We know, too, that the patience of the people of the world is not very great. For better or worse, they are moving rapidly. One of the best ways to grapple with the problem of human impatience is to speed up the educative process in their lands. For that reason, it is believed that if we could encourage, through the use of foreign currencies, and through the United Nations organization itself, the development in other countries, of institutions of higher learning, such as teachers' colleges, for example, we could facilitate the achievement of the end without too much disorder.

The foreign policy of the United States has for some time suffered criticism for being directed toward the maintenance of an unsatisfactory status quo. Administration measures have often seemed to be motivated only by the desire to "counterpunch." The dramatic changes which are taking place throughout the world have made this method bankrupt. It is not enough merely to counterpunch, and it is up to the majority in this session of Congress to provide the administration and the Nation with the new leadership which is so necessary if the United States is to play a constructive role in the great events of the future.

The McGee-Johnson concurrent resolution is an attempt to seize the initiative in an especially critical area of world affairs. Its sponsors feel it has the following points in its favor:

First. It calls upon the United Nations to develop the detailed plan upon which this international education program would be built. In this way, it will be

possible for the nations which make up this organization to work together, and the program developed will be free of the stigma of having been "Made in America."

Second. The concurrent resolution provides for the use of the inconvertible foreign currencies which are piling up in various countries of the world from appropriations made for other purposes. It should be possible to use these currencies for a constructive program, and their use would avoid, we hope, at least the immediate necessity for direct appropriations.

Third. The present method of bringing students from underdeveloped areas to study and receive training in this and other Western nations often fails in its purpose either because the student wishes to stay here when his training is completed, or because he has serious trouble adjusting to living and working conditions in his native country when he returns to put his training to use. These difficulties could be avoided by training the needed engineers, teachers, and other professional personnel required for these areas in regional schools closer to their homes.

Fourth. The presence of qualified technical and professional faculties in these areas, conducting and directing scholarly research, would provide a source of consultation and assistance on technical aid and other projects. It would also make possible a more objective and constructive appraisal of such things as project loan proposals.

Fifth. Since the areas of the world which do not now have adequate systems of primary and secondary education cannot be expected to develop them without large numbers of qualified teachers, and since these areas cannot be expected to develop strong economies without competent professional people in other fields, [illegible] is now ripe for the development of an international educational program which is acceptable because sponsored and planned by the United Nations, and which is feasible because of the willingness of Congress to propose it and to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing it to fruition.

For these reasons, I submit the concurrent resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk through April 24, in order to give other Senators an opportunity to cosponsor it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States has benefited greatly from the exchange of students between our own country and other countries through the Fulbright Acts and Smith-Mundt Acts; and

Whereas, the other nations of the world have in recent years experienced remarkable growth in the number of persons trained through the operations of these and similar programs; and

Whereas, increasing the level of education and attainment of the peoples of the world is the most productive investment that the nations of the world can make for the well-being of all mankind; and

Whereas, international educational programs enhance international understanding and thereby promote the cause of peace; and

Whereas, the cause of peace can be served by increasing cooperation among peoples of other nations in the pursuit of educational attainment; and

Whereas, many nations or regions of the world not now possessing universities, colleges and technical institutes are now on the threshold of readiness to create and operate such universities, colleges and technical institutes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby expresses its interest in encouraging the development outside continental United States of international educational programs, both graduate, including regional graduate schools, and undergraduate, including teachers colleges, technical institutes, as well as other colleges and universities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress hereby recommends that the U.S. Government encourage the United Nations Organization through its special fund or otherwise to undertake to develop a plan for international educational cooperation that would best serve the needs of the several member countries, as well as the cause of world peace and international economic and social development; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress hereby expresses its willingness to accept a reasonable share of the cost of bringing into operation certain aspects of such a plan through the use of foreign currencies available for these uses, or otherwise as may prove suitable and desirable.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HOLLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1555, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1555, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

Senate bill 1555, as reported, permits the Secretary of Labor to exempt unions of less than 200 members and gross annual receipts of less than $20,000 from its financial reporting requirements. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has opposed this exemption, pointing out that all union members should have governmental protection of union funds, regardless of whether they are part of a small or a large union.

The Secretary pointed out that in the disclosures of the McClellan committee "some of the very difficult problems" and "some of the messier situations arose in these small unions." He emphasized that some of the most corrupt unions, such as the Johnnie Dio paper locals, could, under some future Secretary of Labor, evade the financial reporting requirements.

The argument has been made that these reporting requirements would be burdensome to the smaller union; but the bill already contains a provision giving the Secretary of Labor ample authority to prescribe simplified reports for small unions and small employers where more detailed reports would be burdensome.

My amendment would close a significant loophole in the effective protection of union members and the general public. I believe all union members should be given equal treatment under the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PAY AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1959, the name of Senator BUSH was added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 102) directing the Committee on Rules and Administration to report a pay and classification system for employees of Senators, submitted by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. HUMPHREY) on April 15, 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by William E. Warne on award as United Nations Command Economic Coordinator in Korea.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Editorial entitled "Keep Fighting," from the Exeter News-Letter, paying tribute to Senator COTTON.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorials on the Oregon Dunes Seashore area, published in recent editions of the Oregon Journal, the Eugene Register-Guard, and the Astorian-Budget.

Article entitled "Oregon Centennial," published in the Mainliner of April 1959, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. GORE:

Editorial entitled "Ike's Strange Behavior," published in the Washington Daily News of April 20, 1959.

Letter entitled "What Price Steel?" written by Eugene Havas, and published in the Washington Post of April 20, 1959.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "New Atom Smasher To Be Installed at University of Wisconsin Is First of Its Kind in United States," published in the Janesville, Wis., Daily Gazette of April 15, 1959.